



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,410	11/12/2003	Jerry Joe Wolfe JR.	102-1189	6794

7590 07/05/2005
J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr.
Suite 43
913 Gulf Breeze Parkway
Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

EXAMINER

SMITH, KIMBERLY S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,410

Applicant(s)

WOLFE ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly S. Smith

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/12/03 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 04/18/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the arguments that Nasser describes only one compartment, hollow inner sphere 20 for receiving fish food and does not disclose a exterior form including at least one space for containing items, this is respectfully disagreed with. The Applicant is correct in stating that the interior form compartment is that defined by (20). The exterior form is that defined by (22) and as such, the compartment in the exterior form of Nasser is that area exterior of (20) and interior of (22). As can be seen in Figure 2, the exterior includes at least one space for containing items (i.e. the area shown exterior of (20) containing two pellets (26)). As such, Nasser anticipates the claimed invention of claims 1 and 13.
2. Regarding the Applicant's arguments with respect to the Wang reference, it is noted that the Applicant has not claimed a dimension for the container and as such, any open area within a form meets the claimed limitation of an open space. It has been held that the recitation in with respect to the manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. As such, the structural limitation of claim 1a) reads as an exterior form, with an outside and an inside (met by Wang having a thickness of the exterior wall), surrounding an interior form with a compartment wherein said exterior form includes at least one space...and wherein said compartment includes at least one space... As such, Wang discloses the structurally claimed limitations of the invention. It is further noted that Wang also meets the intended use recitation as the contained item could be inclusive of a particle as small as a speck

Art Unit: 3644

of dust, a coating of powdered medication or a liquid flavor enticement brushed onto the interior of the compartment.

3. Regarding the Applicants arguments regarding Mauldin not disclosing a sinuous raised edge, this is respectfully disagreed with. "Sinuous" is defined as a wavy form. As can be seen in Figure 2, Mauldin discloses the raised edge which is consistent to the graphic representation of $\frac{1}{2}$ of a wavelength of sine as depicted on a horizontal axis and thereby meets the definition of sinuous.

4. It is respectfully noted to the claim drafter that the independent claim 1 is broad enough to read on structures ranging from a house (with the house being the exterior form and a refrigerator being the interior form), a car (with the car body being the exterior form and the glove compartment being the interior form) or an airplane (with the fuselage being the exterior form and the cargo hold being the interior form).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3, 7, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Nasser, US Patent 6,109,210.

Art Unit: 3644

Regarding claims 3 and 16, it can be clearly seen in Figure 2 that the interior form is located below the horizontal centerline of the exterior form and is therefore offset from a center location of the exterior form.

7. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-13, 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang, US Patent 6,073,581

Wang discloses a container comprising an exterior form (3, 4) surrounding an interior form (defined by sections 36, 37), having at least one opening in the interior form (i.e. 30, 40) and at least one opening in the exterior form (33, 34)

Regarding claim 5, Wang discloses a removable cap (21).

Regarding claim 6, the removable cap of Wang is capable of being eaten and therefore is considered to be edible.

Regarding claim 9, Wang discloses the exterior form including an interior recess(34) for retaining a removable cap.

Regarding claim 10, Wang discloses the use of two openings.

Regarding claim 11, Wang discloses the at least one opening in the interior form comprises two openings.

Regarding claim 12, reference claims 10 and 11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3644

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang, US Patent 6,073,581 in view of Rucker, US Patent 6,634,318.

Wang discloses the invention as claimed including a cap that is capable of being eaten. Rucker teaches within the analogous art of animal closures that closures for feeding toys may be created from a material that may be more palatable to an animal to make the feeding toy more attractive to the animal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a palatable material as taught by Rucker with the device of Wang in order to produce a more enticing feeding toy to the animal.

10. Claims 8, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nasser, US Patent 6,109,210 in view of Maudlin, Jr. (US 5,813,366).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Nasser discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However Nasser does not disclose the use of at least one flap. Maudlin teaches within the same field of animal feeding devices the use of a flap (12) for limiting the size of the opening dependent upon the size of the food being distributed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching of Maudlin's flap with the device of Nasser to allow for varying sizes of feed to be distributed.

Regarding claim 15, Nasser discloses the invention with the exception of the sinuous raised edge on the exterior of the ball. Maudlin teaches the use of a sinuous raised edge on the exterior of the ball to encourage play and use in the event the food product is absent. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 3644

use the sinuous raised edge as taught by Mauldin to encourage play of the animal in the absence of food product.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly S. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-6909. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 10:00-4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimberly S Smith
Examiner
Art Unit 3644

kss



TERI PHAM LUU
SUPERVISORY
PRIMARY EXAMINER